DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 048 FL 012 238

AUTHOR Proschan, Frank
TITLE Of Puppet Voices and Interlocutors: Exposing Essences of Puppetry and Speech.
INSTITUTION Southwest Educational Development Lab., Austin, Tex.
PUB DATE Nov 80
NOTE 34p.; In its Working Papers in Sociolinguistics, Number 79, p1-31 Aug 1980. Small print may be marginally legible.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Discourse Analysis; Language Processing; Language Research; *Language Usage; Language Variation; *Puppetry; *Semiotics; Sociolinguistics; *Speech Communication; Symbolic Language

ABSTRACT

Puppetry has potential for illuminating many aspects of human life. One of these aspects, the system of language and speech, is explored here. An examination of the widespread use of a voice-modifying instrument to provide the puppets' voices demonstrates that traditional puppeteers act both as folk linguists and as folk sociolinguists. The study examines several examples of puppet dialogue from different traditions in which voice modifiers are used. In all the traditions, it is found that the resources available to the puppeteer to increase the intelligibility of his distorted voice operate in three areas: dialogue, communicative event, and speech itself. In addition to speech modifiers, the use of other devices, such as foreign language words or accent, are examined for their ability to provide a distinct language in which puppets can interact. Three conclusions are derived from the study: (1) human speech is capable of being distorted and reduced without its sense being sacrificed, because of the inherent redundancies built into the speech system itself; (2) speech has its locus in dialogue and understanding is necessarily dialogic in nature; and (3) the essence of all art is the dynamic tension between illusion and reality. (AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Working Papers in Sociolinguistics, No. 79.

ED200048

OF PUPPET VOICES AND INTERLOCUTORS: EXPOSING ESSENCES OF PUPPETRY AND SPEECH

Frank Proschan

University of Texas, Austin

Sociolinguistic Working Paper

NUMBER 79

November 1980

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory

211 East Seventh Street

Austin, Texas

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Frank Proschan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL 012 238

OF PUPPET VOICES AND INTERLOCUTORS: EXPOSING ESSENCES OF PUPPETRY AND SPEECH[1]

Frank Proschan

University of Texas, Austin

> The relationship of the sign to the object signified, and especially the relationship of the representation to the object represented, their simultaneous identity and difference, is one of the most dramatic semiotic antinomies.
>
> Jakobson[2]

> The most ancient forms for representing language were organized by laughter...
>
> Bakhtin i.p.

Folk puppetry is terrain virtually unexplored by scholars, yet terrain of striking beauty and remarkable fertility. The world's peoples have developed diverse solutions to the puppeteer's problem--a problem whose very nature determines the singular importance that traditional puppetry can hold for scholarly understanding. The task of the puppeteer is simply stated: to present and represent human life in all its multiformity and human communication in its myriad channels and forms. As scholars faced with the same responsibility, we are fortunate to have much of our work already done for us by traditional puppeteers through the centuries. Folk puppetry demonstrates a long process of observation and analysis of human activity, coupled with experimentation and innovation in the dramatic portrayal of that activity.

Among traditional art forms, puppetry is especially capable of showing social life as a whole. As a multi-channeled communicative event, a puppetry performance can present an artist's perception of everything from kinesics to caste, from linguistics to laughter. The folk puppeteer acts as folk semiotician, exploring, utilizing, and often expanding the communicative resources offered to him by the community in which he lives and performs. Having asserted an ambitious potentiality for puppetry to illuminate many aspects of human life, I want to explore but one of the social systems that puppetry presents: the system of language and speech, that system which is often said to in fact define humanity. An examination of what

strikes us initially as a curiosity, the widespread use of a voice-modifying instrument to provide the puppets' voices, will demonstrate that traditional puppeteers act both as folk linguists (penetrating to essential attributes of speech production and perception) and as folk sociolinguists (drawing on all of the linguistic resources of their societies in order to enact their performances). This analysis will in turn reflexively expose some essential attributes of puppetry itself.

The distribution of voice modifiers in folk puppetry is recorded in brief and tantalizing notices scattered throughout the historical and ethnographic treatments of puppetry. In European traditions, these notices begin with the start of the seventeenth century. Ubeda (1912 [1608]:80-81) describes puppets in Seville which use a *cerbatana* (lit. 'pea-shooter' or 'blow-gun') and Covarrubias remarks the use of a *pito* ('whistle') by the puppeteers of Castille with an interpreter in front of the stage to repeat the lines (1963 [1611]: 964). Varey (1957:94-95) documents the practice in present-day Catalonia. Turning to Italy, we learn from Saverio Quadrio that the seventeenth century Pulcinella puppeteers used a *pivetta* (diminutive of *pivo*, 'whistle') to recite the stories, with one puppeteer providing all the voices, or several, each one with a *pivetta* of a different size, providing the voices of the various characters (in Speaight 1955:38).

The earliest evidence from England is ambiguous: in Ben Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair* of 1614, there is a puppet-play-within-the-play, and the puppets are described as "neighing" and "hinnying" with a "treble creaking" (Jonson 1614:V:v:50-70). But, the puppets' creaking is interpreted to the audience by Leatherhead, who repeats line by line what the puppets are saying, like the interpreter that Covarrubias described for the puppets of Seville. By the 1660s, Punch had arrived in England, and his use of the swazzle or swotchel (from German *schwatzel*, lit. 'conversation, chatter') was firmly established (see Speaight 1955:90 and Mayhew 1861:V3:51-68). Baretti, at the end of the eighteenth century, traces the name Punchinello to the Italian

> Pulcinella, which means a hen-chicken. I need not tell you that chicken's voices are squeaking and nasal: and for this reason as well as because chickens are timid and powerless, my whimsical countrymen have given the name of Pulcinella, or Hen-Chicken, to that comic character...[the puppeteer] speaks with a tin whistle in his mouth, which makes him emit that comical kind of voice (in Byrom 1972:69 and Speaight 1955:172).

We also find this instrument used by the puppeteers of eighteenth century France, where in 1722, Abbé Cherier reports, Polichinelle was permitted by the censors to play his comedies only if they were performed with the *sifflet-pratique* and included a "neighbor or associate who interrogates him by questions, and to whom Polichinelle responds with his usual bawdy precision," (in Magnin 1862:156). In Germany, Boehn reports (1932:311), the voice modifier was employed to provide the voice of the Devil. In Russia, Petrushka also spoke through a whistle-like voice modifier, a *pishchik*. Roman Jakobson recalls the performances of itinerant Petrushka puppeteers before the First World War. As the puppeteer approached a court of Moscow suburbs, usually accompanied by an organ-grinder, the whistle would announce their arrival. In the performances, the whistled speech alternated with natural speech, so that Petrushka would say something through the voice modifier, then the puppeteer or organ-grinder would repeat it in a speaking voice (Jakobson p.c.).

Further east, we learn from Hafiz Baghban, the Iranian and Afghani hand puppeteers use a *saffir* or *wazeezak* or *pustak* (1977:155), a reed instrument held in the puppeteer's mouth. Metin And also notes this, and mentions the Turkish *Karagöz* puppeteers' use of a *nakeke* of the same kind (1979:107). In Pakistan and India, the Rajasthani *kathputli* marionettes use a *boli* (lit. 'speech') and also employ an interpreter/musician. The *Aragouz* glove puppets of Egypt use a voice modifier called *amana* through which the puppeteer speaks, sometimes for all of the characters and sometimes only for the hero Aragouz. A musician outside the puppet booth engages the puppets in dialogue. Sergei Obraztsov reports that Chinese hand puppeteers use a voice modifier (1961:21) and On Kon Cho (1979:37) and Michael Malkin (1977:149) report that Korean puppeteers spoke through a bamboo pipe or reed in a squeaky voice.

In several of the great theatrical puppetry traditions of Africa we encounter the same practice. Darkowska-Nidzgorska and M'Diaye note that the Bamana puppets of Mali speak

> with a husky and breathy voice, the distortion obtained thanks to a small kazoo, one end of which is obstructed by a spider web or by a membrane taken from the wing of a bat. The words of the puppets are thus rendered incomprehensible and must be translated to the spectators, measure by measure, by an interpreter, also called spokesman (1977).

The same instrument is used in the *ekong* puppetry of the Ibibio of Nigeria (Talbot 1923:77-78 and Messenger 1971 and 1973). Among the Bornu of northern Nigeria, the instrument takes the form of two plates bound together; the effect is to produce a "shrill whistle, far shriller than that of the English Punch and Judy performer...The words of the puppets, being almost indistinguishable, are repeated by one of the assistants standing by" (Ellison 1935:89-91; see also Chesnais n.d.).[3]

We see certain common features in these accounts. First, with the possible exception of the Turkish *Karagöz*, voice modifiers are used exclusively for three-dimensional puppetry and are not reported for shadow puppets. They fall into three groups: those held in the back of the mouth (usually two hard plates bound together with a vibrating ribbon between them); those held at the front of the mouth (these also use a vibrating reed); and those held outside the mouth (these are tube kazoos). Significantly, in many of the cases cited, the voice modifiers are found in use along with an interpreter or interlocutor. The interlocutor may employ a peculiar form of dialogue which involves his or her repetition, often in the form of questions, of the puppet's distorted statements. Where an interlocutor is not present, it is often the puppeteer who provides this questioning repetition, either with lines spoken by other puppet characters in normal voices, or in lines spoken by the incorporeal, unseen, and anonymous narrator (the puppeteer himself).

In using the voice modifier, the puppeteer can aim for easy intelligibility, for absolute inscrutability, or for some mid-point. The goal varies from one tradition to another, in fact, from one moment to another within a performance. For example, in the *kathputli* tradition, Nazir Jairazbhoy reports (1980), the distorted voice is sometimes used to transmit cues from the puppeteer to the musician, who cannot see what is happening on stage or backstage. Here secrecy is desired and the voice modifier is used as an encrypting device, to hide meaning from the audience's ears. The very name of the Egyptian instrument, *amana*, reflects a similar wish for secrecy, according to *Aragouz* puppeteer Achmad Sharawi. The word "*amana*," literally a surety or collateral, is used in conversation when two people wish to refer, in the presence of other listeners, to something (money, a debt, a business matter) without the listeners understanding. If the puppeteer loses his voice modifier, Sharawi explains, he can ask

an assistant "Give me my *amana*," that is, "Give me my business-between-us," without revealing the real name for the whistle and without revealing the secret of the puppet voices.[4] The other extreme of intelligibility is illustrated by performances of "mood signs" or vocalizations--laughter, sobbing, sighs--which are impervious to interpretation yet unmistakeable in their meaning. The ambiguous mid-ground is the locus (the playground) of artistic creativity.

* * * * * * * * *

We must state as a general rule that the use of a voice modifier necessarily results in impeded speech, with some inherent difficulty in comprehension. In the most familiar case, the Punch puppeteer's swazzle (or the Egyptian puppeteer's *amana*), the swazzle replaces the larynx in providing the 'voice,' (i.e. the vibration source). In addition, the necessity of holding the swazzle against the palate reduces in small part the mobility of the tongue, yet lips and jaws are unrestricted in their movement. The *kathputli* puppeteer's *bolī*, by contrast, is held between the front teeth, immobilizing the jaw and limiting somewhat the motion of the lips, while leaving the larynx, soft palate, and tongue to operate freely. This permits the puppeteer to speak through the instrument, adding a buzz to his normal voice. The *bolī* can also act like the swazzle, as an original source of vibrations. However an important difference in this latter case is that the articulatory mechanisms of palate and tongue are applied before the production of the 'voice' and are consequently less effective (although not totally ineffective). Finally, the tube kazoos immobilize the jaws like the *bolī*, but are incapable of originating vibrations. They buzz in sympathy with the vibrations produced by the larynx, thus requiring that the puppeteer speak through the instrument. The immobilization of the teeth and/or lips can make certain sounds difficult: labials and dentals, especially voiceless ones.

If, then, we assume that one or another of these impediments is present to reduce the phonological repertoire of speech, what are the other resources available to the puppeteer to increase the intelligibility of his distorted voice? These operate in three areas: that of dialogue, that of communicative event, and that of speech itself.

Dialogue

The major aid to understanding is the peculiar form of dialogue we have noted. Frank Bellew in 1866 gave an amusing lesson in how this dialogue should be structured:

> As Mr. Punch's voice is, at the best of times, rather husky, it is necessary that the exhibitor should have a colleague or interpreter among the audience who knows the play by heart, and who, from practice, can understand what Mr. Punch says better than the audience. This person must repeat after Punch whatever he may say, only not to wound his feeling, he must do so in the form of questions--for example, suppose Mr. Punch says, 'Oh, I've got such a pretty baby!' The showman outside must repeat: 'Oh, you've got a pretty baby, Mr. Punch, have you? Where is she?' (Bellew 1866:46-47).

Edgar Bergen provides the same instructions for ventriloquial dialogue with a dummy, noting that "When they hear your distinct repetition of the dummy's indistinct words, your listeners will not notice the slurring of the puppet's speech" (1938?:74).

This simple repetition is often not readily apparent from published transcripts. With the conventions of performance being well-established, a graphic representation of every repetition is unnecessary. In actual performance repetitions are more frequent than scripts would indicate. The simplest type is direct repetition, illustrated in a performance by Percy Press, Jr.:

> Judy: What do you want?
>
> Punch: A kiss!
>
> Judy: A kiss! Girls and boys, shall I give Punch a kiss? (Press performance).

or repetition recast as interrogatory remark:

> Judy: Punch, what shall we do now?
>
> Punch: Oh, let's have a dance!
>
> Judy: Let's have a dance? Okay, Punch...(Press performance).

Repetition provides an opportunity for statements to be misconstrued:

> Punch: Oh, what a beauty!
>
> Judy: Pardon, Punch?
>
> Punch: What a beauty!
>
> Judy: Oh, "What a beauty!" I thought you said, "What a bighead." (Press performance).

or purposely re-construed:

Punch: And who sent for you?
Constable: I am sent for you.
Punch: I don't want constable. I can settle my own business without constable, I thank you. I don't want constable.
Constable: But the constable wants you. (Collier 1828).

Although conclusive evidence is lacking which would prove that Ben Jonson's puppets used a swazzle, *Bartholomew Fair*'s puppet play is a rich source of similar dialogue (which would be just as useful if the puppets spoke in distorted voices or falsetto with no modifying instrument employed). For example, this dialogue among the puppets, their interpreter Leatherhead, and the audience member Cokes:

Leatherhead: They are whoremasters both, sir, that's a plain case.
Puppet Pythias: You lie like a rogue.
Leatherhead: Do I lie like a rogue?
Puppet Pythias: A pimp and a scab.
Leatherhead: A pimp and a scab?
I say between you, you have both but one drab.
Puppet Damon: You lie again.
Leatherhead: Do I lie again?
Puppet Damon: Like a rogue again.
Leatherhead: Like a rogue again?
Puppet Pythias: And you are a pimp again.
Cokes: And you are a pimp again, he says.
Puppet Damon: And a scab again.
Cokes: And a scab again, he says.
Leatherhead: And I say again you are both whoremasters again,
And you have but one drab again. (Jonson V.IV.220-232).

This dialogue of fourteen turns in fact consists of only four statements: *they are whoremasters both, you lie like a rogue, [you are] a pimp and a scab,* and, *you have both but one drab.*

In *Bartholomew Fair*, there are interpreters at two levels: Leatherhead who interprets for Cokes-the-audience, and Cokes (the real audience's surrogate on stage) who interprets for the real audience. We will have further occasion to discuss this circumstance below, but the more common practice is to have just one interpreter, or, as with Percy Press, none

at all. The single interpreter is typified by Petrushka's musician, as in Obraztsov's description of a dialogue between puppeteer Ivan Zaitsev and his wife:

> Now I recalled that during the performance in the yards the hurdy-gurdy player had slipped in questions now and again, and I realized that this was necessary because it was not always easy to make out what Petrushka was saying in that shrill voice of his: the questions helped to make the meaning clear (Obraztsov 1950:104-105).

This same structure of distorted statement-questioning repetition is encountered in circus clowning and rodeo clowning (Stoeltje p.c.). The alternative employed by Percy Press is to assign the repetitions to whichever puppet is conversing with Punch. A similar internalized dialogue is carried on by American folk musicians performing harmonica virtuoso pieces in which the harmonica is made to talk (Licht 1979) and by blues singers' conversations with their "talking" guitars.

The mental mechanism by which this form of dialogue works is the human brain's marvelous capacity for what Hugh Mehan and Houston Wood call the "retrospective linking of subsequent conditions to antecedent ones [which is] a basic feature of commonsense reasoning" (1975:123). This process of retrospective reconstitution works in speech perception not only at the gross level of phrases or sentences, as in these examples, but also at the level of phonemes, where the sense we give to them in perception is alterable to accommodate newer information. We go back to make sense of something which initially had another sense or none at all. (This is the operating principle of one class of puns--words change their meanings as other words follow them.)

Communicative Event

The second factor at work to increase intelligibility is the nature of puppetry performance as a multichanneled communicative event. Face-to-face interaction is the locus for normal speech. Puppetry too features visual and auditory channels simultaneously at work. These channels may be used complementarily or at cross-purposes. If the puppeteer wishes, he can have the puppet gesture and behave so as to clarify its statements. These gestures may be part of the system of human gestures of the culture involved. In other cases, a system of gestures specific to puppets may

be used, but if it is sufficiently well-known to audiences, it can serve to disambiguate the puppet speech.[5] The appearance of the puppets, their actions and gestures, can help to clarify their distorted speech, by virtue of the inherent redundance of face-to-face communication. But, although the visual message and the aural one can be complementary, the visual image and the gestural repertoire are also reduced or restricted. The puppet never bears all the marks of the person, animal, or spirit it represents. Certain signs are selected for inclusion and others are omitted. Yet the effect of the confluence of the visual channel and the aural channel is greater than their sum. Another convention of many theatrical traditions also operates at the level of communicative event. Actors and puppets are granted great freedom to tell us what it is they are doing at the moment as in Punch explaining, "I'm going downstairs to light the gas..." (Press performance). The speech is understood because it describes actions visible to the audience.

Speech Itself

Yet, we must finally ask, how much sense can we perceive in the distorted statements without the clarifying repetition or visual reinforcement? In many cases, the distorted speech functions in the manner of speech surrogates, the drum and whistle systems that Theodore Stern describes as "abridging systems." There is a close correspondence between the contours of natural speech and the contours of the puppet speech, like that which Stern notes for speech surrogates:

> Each transmitted sign exhibits significant resemblance to a corresponding sound of the base message [natural language]. An abridging system, while preserving some phonic resemblances to the base utterance, represents only part of its phonemic qualities...(1957:487).

These speech surrogates, and the voice modifiers of puppetry, operate by a process of reduction--certain elements of the sign (speech) are selected for re-presentation and others are eliminated. This phonological reduction results in ambiguity, which is defeated in the drum and whistle systems by repetition, circumlocution, or paraphrasis. We have seen that puppetry also uses repetition, yet even this may not be critical to the intelligibility of puppet speech. As the recent work of semioticians analysing and reevaluating speech surrogates has demonstrated, these whistle and drum systems are not limited, as was once thought, to tonal

languages(Umiker 1974 and Sebeok and Umiker-Sebeok 1976). There seems to be a flexibility to human speech that we are only beginning very tentatively to understand. The crucial element in this flexibility is the aural redundance of speech itself, noted by Colin Cherry when he writes:

> It seems that normal speech contains many more clues than are barely necessary to convey a message. It forms a highly 'redundant' signaling system...extraordinarily resistant to distortion and disturbances of many kinds (Cherry 1966:165).

Although the experimental data that led Cherry to this conclusion doesn't exactly duplicate the situation of puppet voices, traditional puppeteers for centuries have depended on this redundance and resistance to distortion, long before scientists discovered it.

Obviously, the various vocal and articulatory mechanisms (larynx, tongue, palate, teeth, and lips) together provide a surplus of signification. Together, they permit unambiguous speech; in fact, in normal speech they generally push ambiguity out of the phonological realm into the realms of semantics, syntactics, and discourse.

* * * * * * * * * *

The fact that puppeteers around the globe make use of voice modifiers suggests to me their profound understanding of how they work--that is, their awareness that speech itself is redundant, and that reduction in the sign and restriction of the signal are possible without sacrificing intelligibility; further, that dialogue can be structured and actions and gestures employed so as to clarify the distorted speech even further. Yet none of this is sufficient to explain why puppeteers go through so much trouble. The knowledge that humans can successfully walk on their hands has convinced very few to eschew their feet. Yet who are those few hand-walkers? Performers, who utilize hand-walking for artistic purposes, just as puppeteers have incorporated distorted speech as an artistic resource in their performances. What purposes impel the use of these artistic resources?

A number of possible motivations are at work, to different degrees within each tradition. We have seen some noted already: the distinctive sound of the voice modifier alerts audiences to the arrival of the puppeteers and the beginning of the performance, for example (Speaight 1955:38, Jakobson p.c., Warner 1977:119, Jairazbhoy 1980). Another has been barely noted above although it is certainly extremely important: the squeaky voice is inherently funny,

especially to the children who often comprise the largest part of the audience for the performance traditions which employ voice modifiers. It is worthy of note that these traditions are mostly fairground, carnival, or village traditions, whose audiences include children. Puppetry traditions with their sources in court entertainments or classical literature such as Indonesian *wayang* or Sicilian and Belgian chivalric marionettes generally do not employ voice modifiers, although they are rich in sociolinguistic manipulation.

The most complete analysis of a single tradition is Nazir Jairazbhoy's work with the *kathputli* string puppets of India and Pakistan. He identifies a number of practical factors at work: The *boli* can be used for 'secret' communication (the transmission of cues from puppeteer to musician) or for communication between puppets. It is used in imitating animals such as partridges, cocks, and horses, or to imitate human laughter or crying. It is used as a musical instrument to produce a heterophonic or polyphonic effect when combined with the musician's voice and drum in the interludes between vignettes. During the action of the play, the chirping of the voice modifier can be used to produce an abstract sense of excitement and activity. As noted above, the *boli* serves as a trademark for the *kathputli* puppeteers, announcing their arrival in high-pitched sounds to which children can be expected to attend more than adults, as when American children notice the bells of the ice-cream vendor which adults barely notice (Jairazbhoy 1980).

Voice modifiers also can mark when particular characters are speaking. In Germany, only the Devil spoke with one, while in Italy several manipulators used differently-pitched *pivettas*, "either longer or smaller or more open or more closed, to produce the correct voice of the character he is playing..." (Quadrio in Speaight 1955:38). Petrushka and Punch share the characteristic of being the only figures in their plays who utilize the voice modifier, while the other puppets speak normally--or rather, without instrumental distortion. Percy Press Jr. explains the necessity of Punch's voice in part as a result of his behavior and his identity as a trickster or anti-hero. Punch assaults authority and violates the standards of civil behavior, doing things that are 'larger than life:'

> There is only one Punch and Judy story, about Punch beating his wife, the baby, the policeman, and ousting the hangman. There's only one story, but it's a controversial story. But by him having the voice, that in my estimation takes the cruelty out of the story. (Press Interview)

Achmad Sharawi also explains the distorted voice as being crucial to establishing Aragouz's distinctive character:

> Without the zmaar, the Aragouz would be no Aragouz. It becomes like any other person saying, "How are you," "Good morning." He is only Aragouz because of this distorted voice. (Sharawi Interview)

I should note that while speaking through the voice modifier is not exceedingly difficult, it is much harder to keep the instrument in place in the mouth and speak in a normal voice, as is necessary when the puppeteer (whose hands are of course occupied with the puppets) has two puppets engage in dialogue, alternating distorted and undistorted lines. The virtuoso Egyptian puppeteer, Achmad Sharawi, skillfully switched between the squeaky voice of Aragouz (like Punch,a trickster figure) and the normal voices of the other characters. However, other reports of the Aragouz tradition (and Sharawi's own comments in an interview) hold that all of the puppets had squeaky voices and only the musician outside the booth spoke in a normal voice (Farghaly p.c.). This latter practice characterizes Catalonian performances, with all the puppets speaking in squeaks (Varey 1957:94-5).

In this regard an important comparison with some traditions that do not employ voice modifiers reminds us of the puppeteer's problem in making his single voice serve for many characters. Percy Press Jr. has two voices: Punch's squeak and Press's natural voice which serves for Judy, Joey the Clown, the Police Constable, Jack Ketch the hangman, and the other characters. Certainly other Punchmen might give Judy a falsetto voice, or the Negro Jerry a distinctive accent, but Press does not. Achmad Sharawi has Aragouz squeak, with his wife Nefisa's voice noticeably higher in pitch and gentler in tone (except when she's angry) than the male characters. In the Sicilian tradition, where no instrumental modifier is employed, usually a male takes all the male roles and a female speaks the female parts, yet here as in Sharawi's case an effort is usually made to provide varied sounding voices. Papa Michael Manteo covers his mouth with his hand and speaks gruffly for the voice of the giant, while the heroes Orlando and Ricardo have mutually distinctive voices and speaking styles. The supreme master of this multivocality in my acquaintance is Adrien Dufour of Liège, Belgium, who has meek characters and bold ones, falsetto'd women and *basso profundo* heroes, young innocent knights and experienced kings, all distinguishable by their styles of speaking and characteristic voices. There is also Orson, the child brought up by bears, who speaks only in grunts, and the captured Saracen who speaks in terrified stuttering.

I will return below to these traditions as they involve lexical and dialectal manipulation--here I am concerned only with stereotypical speaking styles (an aspect of language and speech still largely neglected by linguists and sociolinguists alike) and with the often problematical relation between stereotypical styles and the real speaking styles to which they refer. Although at the folk level we constantly recognize and produce stereotypical styles of speech, at the scholarly level we are for the most part inarticulate.

In this regard it is particularly important to recall that puppetry borders on and overlaps with other traditions of performing objects: physical artifacts used in narrative and dramatic performances such as scroll paintings, peepshows, masks, and narrated sculptures. These various traditions range from pure narrative forms to pure dialogue forms and include every imaginable mode and means of presenting one character's words in the speech of another--a narrator or another character. This problem of reported speech in narrative and dramatic performance is a larger topic than can be dealt with here, but I must point out some of its immediate implications.[6]

When narrative shifts from telling us what characters *do* to what they *say*, there enter infinite possibilities of attitude, intonation, and interpretation. Bakhtin, Volosinov, and Uspensky elucidate some of these possibilities as they are realized in written literature, especially the novel (Bakhtin 1973, Vološinov 1973, Uspensky 1973), but oral literature has not received such extensive analysis thus far. We can, however, duplicate their first few steps. Noting that "Language is alive only in the dialogical intercourse of those who make use of it....Language's entire life, in whatever area it is used...is permeated by dialogical relationships," (1973:151) Bakhtin explains that our practical everyday dialogue is full of the words of other people, and that frequently our use of another's words is ironical or ambiguous. He quotes Leo Spitzer who notes:

> When we reproduce in our speech a small chunk of our interlocutor's utterances, already by virtue of the change of speakers a change in tone inevitably occurs: *on our lips the "other's" words always sound foreign to us, and very often have an intonation of ridicule, exaggeration, or mockery...* (Spitzer 1922:175-6).

In the genres of conversational narrative (jokes, anecdotes, and memorates, among others), the words of another provide a rich reservoir for humorous exploitation. Here, and especially in the more highly elaborated narrative genres such as tales and myths, there are conventionally stylized modes and

registers of speech which we can employ (just as Adrien Dufour has a repertoire of speech styles) for humorous or other effects. Thus, in telling of Goldilocks, we take on four distinct voices in addition to the narrator voice: Goldilocks, the Papa Bear, the Mama Bear, and the Baby Bear. Importantly,the words of the three bears are not what change, for the most part. Rather, it is their style that shifts and that produces the changes in signification, meaning, and import. It is but a small step from these stylized modes of speech to the forms described for myth-tellings by Sapir, where

> in American mythology certain beings are apt to be definitely characterized by speech particularities. The employment of consonantal play or of similar devices in such cases seems always to have a decidedly humorous effect (1915:186).

Here, style penetrates to the phonemic level, whereas in Goldilocks it rests in the realm of suprasegmentals (tone, pitch, pauses). These speech peculiarities often either duplicate organic speech defects and impediments (Sapir 1915:189) or are

> imitation of the speech of foreigners, particularly of such as speak a dialect divergent enough from the home-dialect to be funny or impressive, yet not so different as to be unintelligible and, therefore, lacking in interest (Sapir 1915:192).

The imitation here is not lexical, but morphophonemic, i.e., speaking with a foreign accent rather than speaking foreign words.

It is also only a small step from the distorted speech Sapir describes (the imitation of speech defects) to the distorted speech produced by voice modifiers in puppetry. Interestingly, the examples he provides of mythological figures who speak with defects include several trickster figures such as the Bushman Mantis and the Kwakiutl Mink (recall Punch, Petrushka, and Aragouz).

Sapir's remarks refer to narrative forms, and in the puppetry forms under discussion here, dialogue has largely supplanted narration, with two qualifications. First, the musician/interlocutor to some extent may supply narration (most prominently in the case of the *kathputli* puppetry), which may also involve 'translation' or 'interpretation' of the puppeteer's distorted words. And second, as I noted above, in drama we grant the characters a special license to tell us what it is they are engaged in doing--narration here is embedded in dialogue, rather than the more frequent case of dialogue embedded in narration. In any case, we must acknowledge continuities (functional and formal, if not evolutionary or historical) in the ways they present another's speech, between

16

narrative forms, on the one hand, and dramatic forms, where the dialogic foundation of living language is made manifest on stage.

To return to Sapir's myths (and, for instance, dialect jokes), another characteristic humorous device of narrative is the use of foreign accents and foreigner's speech. An excellent example of the way puppetry employs such devices comes in an extract from a Petrushka performance, where the puppeteer productively exploits the convention of repetition (Berkov 1953:118):

Petrushka, (to a German):	Bon zhur.	Bon jour.
German: (bows silently)		
Petrushka:	Otchego on molchit?	Why is he silent?
Musician:	Eto nemets.	He is a German
Petrushka:	Nemets! Deĭch, chert by tebя pobral! Da kak ty sюda popal?	A German! Deutsch, damn you! How did you get here?
German:	Ю...Ю...Ю...	I...I...I.../or/ Yes... yes...yes...
Petrushka:	Ty da Ю, nas s toboĭ dvoe...Da ty govori, ne po-voroni, a po-яroslavski.	You and I, we are two... You'd better speak Yaroslav language, not a crow's one.
German:	Va-as?	Wha-at?/or/You-u?
Petrushka:	Kva-as. Kakoĭ tut kvas? Poshel von ot nas, my ne hotim znat' vas. Muzykant! Nemets ushel kvas pit'.	Soda-pop? What soda-pop? Go away from us, we don't want to see you anymore. Musician! The German went to drink soda-pop.

The German's attempt to communicate in his own tongue subjects him to Petrushka's word play. His stuttered

"Yes, yes, yes" Ja,ja, ja /Ю, Ю, Ю/

is taken by Petrushka to be

"I, I, I" Я,Я,Я /Ю, Ю, Ю/

And his bewildered question

"Wha-at?" Wa-as? /va-as/

is twisted by Petrushka into

"Soda-pop" Квас /kvas/

which is then rhymed with "we" нас /nas/ and "you" вас /vas/. Petrushka, speaking through the voice modifier, capitalizes on the multilingual situation to again remind his audience of the ongoing and cumulative intersubjective sense-making which characterizes dialogue, and which I noted above in the

excerpts from Punch and Judy. On first uttering or encountering a word, we may attach one sense to it tentatively, a sense which is subject to reinterpretation or negotiation by the other partner in the dialogue.

The portrayal in puppetry of foreigners is frequent, and is not restricted to those traditions which employ voice modifiers. One further aspect of the use of foreign characters and foreign speech is especially relevant to these traditions, however. I noted above that these genres are generally fairground, carnival, or village forms. Significant here is that they also overwhelmingly are or were itinerant traditions performed by itinerant puppeteers, and often in areas and eras of multilingualism. The European case is most illustrative: the first Punchmen in England were Italians, whose countrymen also took Polichinelle to France. The traveling was certainly not only in one direction, though, so that English puppeteers also traveled to the Continent. Metin And reports the migration of Judeo-hispanic puppeteers to Turkey (1979:107,112). The Russian *skomorokhi* who performed Petrushka ranged from Germany and Italy to Central Asia (Zguta 1978:111), and the *kathputli* puppeteers in one year might range from Multan to Sind, Punjab, and the Northwest Frontier Province in Pakistan; in India from Udaipur to Delhi (Jairazbhoy p.c.). Puppetry was one of a number of genres constituting an entertainment complex which included acrobats; jugglers; musicians; trained bears, monkeys, and dogs; dentists; surgeons; magicians; and others. This pan-Eurasian (and North African) entertainment complex shattered in the West with the social changes of the 17th and 18th centuries, although further east in South and Southwest Asia it continues to this day. Its milieu is frequently multilingual; its performers universally itinerant (see Bakhtin 1968; Burke 1978; Bosworth 1976, Salgado 1977; Bachban 1977; Beeman 1980; and Zguta 1978). The implication of this itinerancy and multilingualism for our discussion of voice modifiers is this: if a visiting puppeteer can not speak the language of his audience well, or if he speaks it only with a strong accent, or if his audience includes speakers of more than one language, two things may result. First, the audience is immediately confronted with what is for them distorted speech (even without the voice modifying instrument) and thus forced to confront the innate variety of human language--a point to which I will return below. Second, in this event, the instrumentally distorted speech might serve as a *lingua franca*, partially understood by most, fully understood by none.

* * * * * * * * * *

There is another very productive way to consider puppet voice modifiers, a road pointed out by Percy Press Jr. when he tells us that the swazzle takes the cruelty out of Punch. Voice modifiers provide a perfect example of a metacommunicative framing device, telling us in Bateson's classic statement, "These actions, in which we now engage, do not denote what would be denoted by those actions which these actions denote," (1955:41) that is, "This is play." The modified speech functions as metacommunication, marking the performance frame in which the puppet play unfolds and telling the audience to interpret the action as art, rather than as reality.[7] This explanation goes a long way toward explaining the ubiquity of voice modifiers, but I believe that it sells short both the voice modifiers and the puppeteers who employ them. This is not to suggest a deficiency in the idea of performance framing; rather it is to acknowledge that it is tempting, and all too easy, to think of a frame as something static and stable. Bateson identifies a second aspect of metacommunicative framing, admittedly of greater complexity: in addition to "this is play," we have the question, "Is this play?" The latter is far more important in explaining puppet voices than the former, because it prevents us from taking a static view and forces our analysis to take account of their dynamism and vitality.

To attempt such an analysis, let us look back again at the interlocutor, who stands before the puppet stage and engages the puppets in conversation. The interlocutor, too, can be considered as a framing device to mark the special realm of the puppets. Yet I would maintain that there is an enormous difference between a frame such as the physical frame of the puppet stage--the proscenium or curtains or booth--and the interlocutor. It is easy to look past the proscenium, to forget that it is there, as we are engrossed in the action on stage. We can attend to the framed action, the on-stage puppet world, and completely disattend the so-called real world which surrounds it. Yet how much more difficult it is to disattend the interlocutor! And why? Because the interlocutor does not just establish a static frame, he or she constantly permeates it, now engaging in dialogue with the puppets, now engaging in dialogue with the audience, now asserting the semiotic system of human communication, now spotlighting the semiotic system of puppet communication. In live drama we are familiar with such intermediaries who constantly permeate the performance frame: the Greek chorus, the on-stage narrator, the prologue and epilogue, the Presenters and Expositers.[8] Their task is somewhat simpler, in that they

are intermediaries between human actors and human audience members, yet like the puppet interlocutors they operate by breaking the performance frame. They help to further the illusion unfolding on stage by seeming to subvert it--they make the frame by breaking it. Meanwhile, they remind us of other frames, like that which enfolds actors and audience together--here not illusion but collusion is at work.[9]

The thing that traditional puppeteers recognized long ago is that the realm of illusion which they create, the world within the frame, can exist only so long as it does not become *too* real, only so long as it is perceived constantly in terms of other realities and other illusions. *Bunraku* puppets of Japan provide the best example of this recognition. The puppets are lifelike, sometimes startlingly real. Puppeteers with enough ingenuity to develop such realistic puppets could certainly have developed them so that the operators were entirely hidden, yet when we see *bunraku* puppets in performance, they are always shadowed by their cloaked manipulators. (The history of Japanese puppetry is the history of the stripping away of curtains that once hid the operators and the chanter-narrator.) In perceiving them, as audience members we constantly oscillate back and forth between seeing only the puppets and seeing them juxtaposed with living human beings. If we did not see the humans, how frightening it could be! Interlocutors, like the other intermediaries of live drama, provide a constant contrast to the stage action of puppets or actors. Our perception of them oscillates between perceiving the stage figures as illusions and perceiving them as real. To perceive one to the exclusion of the other would result in the destruction of the performance--in Don Quixote's attack on the puppet stage or the New York police department being summoned to intervene in a performance of the Mantzo family to save the life of one of the almost-life-size Sicilian knights.

This idea of perception that oscillates between illusion and reality, between sign and signified, is especially useful because it also embraces what may seem to be contrary explanations of the same processes or practices. Puppet voices are sometimes explained, even by the same analyst, in opposite terms: they are small voices to correspond to the diminutive size of the puppets (that is, to reinforce the visual impression) yet they are also capable of producing humorous effect by virtue of their incongruity. If puppets were to speak with normal human voices, analysts suggest, the disparity and disjunction would ruin the illusion. But if puppets speak with

distorted voices, analysts also suggest, they are effective by opposition to human speech. The truth is that both are correct. As we perceive a puppet performance, as it unfolds in time, we sometimes see an internally consistent, mutually reinforcing semiotic system at work. The puppets could only speak in squeaks; it is what Speaight calls their birthright and their ancestral tone (1955:173-4,213). Yet objects of wood or clay, leather or cloth, cannot speak in their own language--they can only speak in human speech, but human speech distorted in some way. We sometimes see not a consistent, reinforcing semiotic system but the interaction of two distinct yet related ones, that of puppets and that of humans.

These distinct communicative systems can hardly be ignored when the human interlocutor stands beside a puppet. Differences in scale and appearance amplify the differences in languages. Certainly the visual systems collide, yet the verbal interplay between puppet and interlocutor also permits the two systems of language to collide, and where better than in dialogue? The interlocutor acts as surrogate for the audience, providing the human side of the dialogue, while the puppet responds in its own words. Sense and meaning are continually being negotiated by the two, constantly shifting and always tentative. Again, Bakhtin's observations on dialogue in conversation are important here. Especially in dialogue, he notes,

> one speaker very often repeats word for word a statement of another speaker, investing it with a new valuation and accenting it in his own way...the repetition of another person's statement in the form of a question leads to a collision of two interpretations in a single word: we are not only asking a question, we are problematizing another person's statement (1973/1963/:161).

As I noted above, the repetitions frequently employed in puppet dialogue can have the effect of clarifying the indistinct speech which preceded them. Conversely, though, the convention of repetition can be exploited for the opposite purpose, to "problematize another person's statement." One speaker's words may be misconstrued by his respondent, as exampled brilliantly in this excerpt from a Petrushka play (Vsevolodskii-Gerngross 1959:126-7):

Having given medicine to Petrushka, the doctor asks for his fee.

Petrushka:	A skol'ko?	And how much?
Doctor:	Tri rubl'.	Three rubles.
Petrushka:	Tri kopeyki.	Three kopecks.
Doctor:	Durak!	Fool!

Petrushka:	Kakoĭ rak?	What crayfish?
Doctor:	Ne rak, a bolvan.	Not crayfish, but blockhead.
Petrushka:	Da, da, Ivan, Ivan.	Yes, yes, Ivan, Ivan.
Doctor:	Pozvol'te za vizit.	Pay me for a visit.
Petrushka:	Seĭchas.	Just a minute.
Doctor:	Musykant, a on ne obmanet?	Musician, is he swindling me?
Musician:	Net, net.	No, no.

But Petrushka reappears with a truncheon and counts out the fee to the doctor with a stick.

Musician:	Chto ty sdelal?	What have you done?
Petrushka:	Ĭa emu zaplatil.	I paid him.
Musician:	Ty zhe ego ubil.	But you killed him.
Petrushka:	Kupil.	Bought.
Musician:	Ne kupil...ubil...On pomer...	Not bought...killed... He died...
Petrushka:	Chto? Povar?	What? A cook?
Musician:	On pokoĭnik.	He is a dead man.
Petrushka:	Polkovnik. Vashe vysoko.... vysoko...ne pereskochish'.	Colonel. Your honor... it is so high you won't get over.
Musician:	Nado khoronit'.	We should bury him.
Petrushka:	Chto? Svarit'?	What? Boil?

Here, Petrushka first misconstrues the words of the puppet Doctor, then the words of the human Musician. Although the human interlocutor's participation in the dialogue spotlights the disparity between the two systems of puppet speech and human speech, the same effect can be achieved when the "straight" puppet characters engage the "distorted" hero in dialogue. Returning to Percy Press Jr.'s performance of Punch and Judy, we see a masterful routine of this type:

Jack Ketch, the Hangman:	Punch, put your head in the...like this..in the loop...
Punch:	In the soup?
Jack:	Not in the soup!
Child:	In the loop! (10)
Jack:	That's right, in the loop.
Punch:	Soup!
Jack:	Not soup!...Then I want you to say, "Ladies and gentlemen..."

Punch:	Ladies and twenty men...
Jack:	Not "ladies and twenty men." I want you to say, "Ladies and gentlemen, I have been a wicked man..."
Punch:	I want some bread and jam...
Jack:	Not you "want some bread and jam"--"I've been a wicked man and the law has found me guilty..."
Punch:	And the floor is jolly dirty...
Jack:	Not "the floor is jolly dirty"--"the law has found me guilty and I must hang by the neck until I am dead, dead, dead,"
Punch:	Bread, bread, bread.

In drawing attention to the ambiguity of speech (puppet or human), the puppeteer again achieves the same purpose as the interlocutor accomplishes: the audience's work is increased, their interpretive burden enlarged, as their creative role expands.

This theory of perception that oscillates between reality and illusion, between the distinct semiotic systems of puppetry and humanity, is drawn in large part from aesthetic theories developed by Prague School semioticians in the first half of this century.[11] Otakar Zich's early writings on theatre and puppetry illuminated the semiotic nature of theatre and the tension between reality and illusion, but he failed to grasp the ever-shifting nature of perception. Thus for him, "we can perceive puppets either as living beings or as non-living puppets...we can perceive them simultaneously only in one way...(1923:8)." Mukařovsky, in elaborating a theory of aesthetics, recounts the story of two members of a theatre audience, one who saw the drama always as if it were real, and the other who insisted that he saw it always as fantasy, yet who in flights of fancy during his perception of the stage action was carried away and for an instant perceived it as real. For Mukařovsky, this anecdote served to illustrate oscillating perception and to support his argument for intentionality and unintentionality as general principles of art and aesthetics (1943). In terms of puppetry and folk theatre, the development of a semiotic theory was the primary concern of Petr Bogatyrev, to whose analyses of puppet voices and the interplay of human and puppet actors I am indebted.

The distinctive distorted voices produced by voice modifiers have served here as an example of a speech system distinct to puppets contrasted in performance with the system of normal speech. Other examples of distinct speaking styles of puppets have been discussed, along with the use of distorted speech in some narrative traditions. Other examples could easily be supplied of traditions of live folk drama in which masked characters or liminal narrators/interlocutors/diviners speak in distorted voices which are then interpreted

to the audience, such as Mummer's plays, to provide only one. In each of these instances, the distortion which is at work is operating at the phonological level, or at the level of speaking style or semantics; I have not heretofore discussed lexical or syntactic distortion.

If, as I suggest, puppet voices are an essential aspect of puppetry, and if the audience for a puppet performance is to be compelled toward an oscillating perception of that performance, and if finally I assert that puppetry is especially concerned with pointing out the dialogic nature of all speech and all understanding, then there must be some way of accounting for the many puppetry traditions which do not employ an instrumental voice modifier. What other means are there for puppeteers to develop a distinct system in which their puppets can speak, and which can collide with normal speech and language to provoke the audience's perceptions? What we find, wherever we look, are an enormous range of creative distortions. In Sicilian puppetry, it may be as simple as the shifting of registers from Italian to Sicilian and back for villains and heroes. Or it may involve mangled syntax. Bogatyrev notes:

> We find this aspiration to create a special theatrical declamation, different from colloquial speech, in old Czech puppeteers. Old puppeteers, conveying the language of upper class heroes--knights, etc.--also distorted common colloquial language, intentionally made grammar mistakes, while puppets depicting peasants spoke Czech correctly (1973:324). (12)

It may involve a stylized delivery, all spoken by one narrator, as in Japanese *bunraku*. A verbal device in which the puppet playwright Chikamatsu excelled was the "pivot word," which "changes its meaning depending on the preceding and following words (Keene 1961:28)." Or it may involve the shifting back and forth between different layers of old and recent language, recently analyzed by A.L. Becker for Javanese *wayang* (1979). Or it may involve everything. Listen to what Metin And identifies as the linguistic resources of Turkish *Karagöz*:

> verbal gags, ludicrous babblings and chattering, nonsensical cross-talk...different dialects and...defects of speech...puns... play upon words. The alteration of a single letter or even of a single accent...rhetorical embellishment, comic elegant diction ...verbal juggling...semantic speculation...ludicrous contrast in meaning...speech defects...quasi-meaningless sounds...verbal anarchy, a confusion of non-words, and empty phrases...malapropism...cacophonies, hyperboles, garrulity, bombast, boastfulness, learned twaddle, and...gibberish (1979:65-67).

As we have seen, many of these same devices are employed as supplementary resources in the puppetry traditions that do employ the voice modifier. In closing, I offer an excerpt from Achmad Sharawi's performance of Aragouz which features a pun on a traditional euphemism for "beggar:" "he who stands at the door of Allah." The Musician tells Aragouz that there is someone to see him, and Aragouz responds

Aragouz:	Raagil ʕala baab allaah?	A beggar? (lit., "A man at the door of Allah?")
Musician:	Ah.	Yes.
Aragouz:	Tab lamma huwwa ʕala baab allah, ʔaaʕid lee ʕala baad ilaragooz?	If he's at the door of Allah, why is he sitting at the door of Aragouz?

(ʕ = pharyngeal voiced fricative; ʔ = glottal stop)

Metin And correctly identifies what is at work in the various verbal devices he enumerates:

> The persistent disparity between normal language and the use or misuse of language by the characters, the perpetual principle of *reductio ad absurdum*, and the sudden and constant shift in the sense of the speaker's word...(1979:67).

The effect is once again to provide a distinct language in which the puppets can interact, and at the same time to remind the audience constantly (as was the case with the use of foreign accents or language) of the innate variety of human language--the coexistence of numerous dialects, idiolects, styles, and registers within any speech community and of numerous meanings often in a single word.

The disparity between normal language and puppet language is as real whether there is one system on stage or both. That is, the dialogue between the two languages can be manifest and impossible to ignore, as when one character speaks "human" speech and another speaks "puppet" speech, or when there is a human interlocutor. Yet the two languages do not need to collide in a dialogue presented on stage. Another dialogue is possible: that between the consistent, coherent semiotic system of puppets and the unforgettable legacy that we necessarily bring to a puppet performance--our own knowledge of what human speech consists of and how it works. The art of the puppeteer is to illuminate human speech by presenting it and its counterparts on stage.

If we look at puppetry as a semiotic system, we see everywhere the basic process of distortion and reduction, incongruity and contradiction, at work.

This results from the essential semiotic tension between sign and signified and from traditional puppeteers' realization that that tension is the essence from which artistic expression is constituted. The sign must be simultaneously like and unlike the signified--the puppet must look like a human but not too much. The visual incongruity is kept constantly obvious to us when there is a human interlocutor who interacts with his tiny inanimate friends. And, the very semiotic system which defines humanness, the system of language and speech, itself becomes the signified and is represented on stage by another system, the sign of the sign which is puppet speech. That system of puppet speech reflects traditional puppeteers' deep and basic understanding of several essential aspects of human communication: first, that human speech is capable of being distorted and reduced without its sense being sacrificed, because of the inherent redundancies built into the speech system itself; second, that human speech has its locus in dialogue, in face-to-face interaction, and that any understanding is necessarily dialogic in nature; and third, that the essence of all art is the dynamic tension between illusion and reality, sign and signified, a tension which is nowhere more artfully manipulated than in the world's puppetry traditions.

NOTES

1
Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the 1979 American Folklore Society meetings and the 1980 Conference on World Traditions of Puppetry and Performing Objects. During its preparation I have been fortunate to receive helpful criticisms and suggestions from Roger Abrahams, Richard Bauman, Frantisek Galan, Archie Green, Tom Green, Nazir Jairazbhoy, Corinne Kratz, Michael Malkin, Dina and Joel Sherzer, Donna Jean Umiker-Sebeok, and Greg Urban. Although I have not been able to include all of their helpful suggestions, I am indebted to them for offering them. Bill Gradante assisted with the Punch transcriptions, Ali Farghaly with the Aragouz materials, and Lena Gorokhova with the Petrushka translations. Completion of this paper was assisted by a grant-in-aid from Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. My thanks to all.

2
Jakobson (1975). He is referring to Pushkin's motif of the statue which comes to life--another form of puppetry.

3
For an organological survey of the related use of voice modifiers in masking, see Balfour (1948); see also Lifschitz (1980) where the masked voices often have no visual manifestation.

4
The interviews and documentation of Achmad Sharawi, Percy Press, Jr., the Manteo family, Adrien Dufour, and Babu Lal Bhat were conducted by researchers from the University of Texas Folklore Center from June 8-14, 1980, with support from the National Endowment for the Humanities. The puppeteers were in Washington, D.C. for a World Puppetry Festival sponsored by Puppeteers of American and folk puppetry performances sponsored by the Smithsonian Institution.

5
A gesture language specific to puppets is reported for the Rajasthani puppets (see Malkin 1977:77), for the doll used by Yoruba ventriloquists (Thompson 1975:55), and for Sicilian puppets (Pasqualino 1977:101-5), among others. In the latter case, further interest is sparked by reports of children imitating the stiff-legged walk of the puppets (Baird 1965:120), much as American children might imitate the voices of Mickey Mouse or Donald Duck.

6
Goffman (1974:505-6, 519-23) discusses reported speech "embedded" in conversation.

7
The theory of meta-communication and frame is developed and elaborated most fully by Goffman (1974). For a specific frame analysis of puppetry, see Hanck (1970).

8
Veltrusky (1978:586, 593) in analyzing these characters points out that they do not necessarily stand for any specific person, they may be anonymous. The referential function of the sign is minimized, and the conative function (using Jakobson's terminology for the 'set-toward' the audience or receiver of a communication) is paramount. He also identifies the same process for theatrical speech as a whole:

> Because it is a sign of a sign, theatrical speech can blur or even eliminate the referential function of the represented character's speech (Veltrusky 1978:569).

Thus we have the common occurrence in folk drama of nonsense speech, and sometimes voice modifiers.

9
Consider the framing complexities of *Bartholomew Fair*, with puppets, their interpreter Leatherhead, a stage audience including Cokes, who interprets for his fellow stage-audience-members, and the theatre audience. Here Cokes is the theatre audience's surrogate or representative on stage, where he can interact with and influence the stage characters. See also Goffman (1974:378ff) on frame-breaking and Bogatyrev (1940).

10
The crucial role of audience members in many puppetry traditions, their direct participation in the dialogue and even in the action, is rarely noted in descriptions of puppet performances and is usually omitted entirely from transcripts.

11
Of the works cited in the Bibliography, see especially Zich (1923), Bogatyrev (1940 and 1973), Mukařovský (1943), and Veltrusky (1978).

12
Something else may be at work here as well, suggested by two sociolinguistic conventions of status reversal reported for the Wolof and Balinese. Judith Irvine notes of the Wolof that:

> the king, at the pinnacle of rank, had a kind of competence for error: he must make mistakes in minor points of grammar, because correctness in these points would be an unnecessary frill, an emphasis on fluency of performance or performance for its own sake, that would not be appropriate to this highest of nobles (Irvine 1975:6).

And Miguel Covarrubias describes Balinese greeting etiquette, which involves a slightly different form of status-switching:

> Then the usual system is adopted; the low man speaks the high tongue and the aristocrat answers in the common language (Covarrubias 1937:51).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

al-Suwayfī, Mukhtār
1967 Khayāl al-ẓill wa-al-'arā'is fī al-'alam. Egypt.

And, Metin
1963-4 A History of Theatre and Popular Entertainment in Turkey. Ankara: Forum Yayinlari.

1979 Karagoz: Turkish Shadow Theatre. Istanbul: Dost.

Baghban, Hafizullah
1977 The Context and Concept of Humor in Magadi Theater. Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University.

Baird, Bil
1965 The Art of the Puppet. New York: The Ridge Press.

Bakhtin, Mikhail
1968 (1965) Rabelais and His World, translated by Helene Iswolsky. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

1973 (1963) Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics, translated by F.W. Rotsel. Ann Arbor?: Ardis.

i.p. (1975) "From the Prehistory of Novelistic Discourse", translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist.

Balfour, Henry
1948 "Ritual and Secular Uses of Vibrating Membranes as Voice-Disguisers," Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute LXXVIII(1-2):45-69.

Bateson, Gregory
1955 "A Theory of Play and Fantasy," Psychiatric Research Reports 2 (December):39-51.

Becker, Alton L.
1979 "Text-Building, Epistemology, and Aesthetics in Javanese Shadow Theatre." In The Imagination of Reality, Alton L. Becker, ed. Norwood, N.J.: ABLEX Publishers, pp. 211-243.

Beeman, William
1980 "Animated Objects and Shamanism in Rural Iran," paper presented at the Conference on World Traditions of Puppetry and Performing Objects.

Bellew, Frank
1866 The Gentle Art of Amusing. n.p.

Bergen, Edgar
1938 (?) How to Become a Ventriloquist. New York: Grosset and Dunlap.

Berkov, P.N.
1953 Russkaя narodnaя drama XVII-XX vekov. Moscow.

Boehn, Max von
1932 Dolls and Puppets. London: G.G. Harrap.

Bogatyrev, Petr
1923 Cesskij kukol'nyj i russkij narodnyj teatr, (Czech puppet theatre and Russian folk theatre,) Sborniki po teorii poeticeskogo jazyka 6. Berlin-Petersburg: OPOJAZ.

1937-8 "Prispevok ku skumaniu divadelnych znakov," ("A contribution to the research of the theatrical sign,") Slovenske smery umelecke a kriticke 5, pp. 238-46.

1976 (1938) "Semiotics in the Folk Theater," In Matejka and Titunik 1976:33-50. (Translation of "Znaky divadelni," Slovo a slovesnost 4, pp. 138-49.)

1940 Lidove divadlo ceske a slovenske. (Czech and Slovak Folk Theatre.) Abbreviated version of Chapter One translated as "Forms and Functions of Folk Theater," in Matejka and Titunik 1976:51-6.

1973 "O vzaimosvjazi dvux blizkix semioticeskix sistem," ("The mutual relation of two similar semiotic systems: the puppet theatre and the theatre of live actors,") In Trudy po znakovym sistemam VI. Tartu State University, pp. 306-329.

Bosworth, Clifford Edmund
1976 The Mediaeval Islamic Underworld, part 1. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Burke, Peter
1978 Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe. London: Temple Smith.

Byrom, Michael
1972 Punch and Judy: its origin and evolution. Aberdeen: Shiva Publications.

Cherry, Colin
1966 On Human Communication. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Chesnais, Jacques
n.d. "Marionnettes africaines," Le theatre dans le monde 14(5):448-51.

Collier, John Payne
1828 Punch and Judy. (From performance by Piccini.) Illustrated by George Cruikshank.

Covarrubias, Miguel
1937 Island of Bali. New York: Knopf.

Covarrubias, Sebastian de
1943 (1611) Tesoro de la lengua castellana, o española. Barcelona: S.A. Horta. (reprint of 1611 edition.)

Darkowska-Nidzgorska, Olenka and Francine N'Diaye
1977 "Marionnettes et marottes d'Afrique noire," Le Courrier du Musée de l'Homme 1 (September).

Ellison, R.E.
1935 "A Bornu Puppet Show," Nigerian Field IV (April):89-91.

Farghaly, Ali
1980 personal communication

Garnault, Paul
1900 History of Ventriloquism, translated by George Havelock Helm.

Goffman, Erving
1974 Frame Analysis. New York: Harper and Row.

Hanck, Gerold
1970 "A Frame Analysis of the Puppet Theater," unpublished paper, University of Pennsylvania.

Irvine, Judith
1975 "Wolof Speech Styles and Social Status," Working Papers in Sociolinguistics 23 (March).

Jairazbhoy, Nazir
1980 "The Function and Purpose of the Kathputli Puppeteer's Boli," paper presented at the Conference on World Traditions of Puppetry and Performing Objects.

Jakobson, Roman
1975 "The Statue in Pushkin's Poetic Mythology," in Pushkin and His Sculptural Myth, by Jakobson, translated by John Burbank. The Hague.

1979 personal communication

Jonson, Ben
1614 Bartholomew Fair.

Keene, Donald
1961 "Introduction," to Major Plays of Chikamatsu, translated by Donald Keene. New York: Columbia University Press.

Licht, Michael S.
1979 "Mouth Harp Miracles: Virtuoso Display in American Harmonica Playing," paper delivered at annual meeting, American Folklore Society.

Lifschitz, Edward
1980 "Acoustic Aspects of Masking in Africa," paper presented at the Conference on World Traditions of Puppetry and Performing Objects.

Magnin, Charles
1862 Histoire des Marionnettes en Europe. Paris: Michel Levy Freres.

Malkin, Michael
1977 Traditional and Folk Puppets of the World. New York: A.S. Barnes.

Matejka, Ladislav and Irwin R. Titunik, eds.
1976 The Semiotics of Art. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Mayhew, Henry
1861 London Labour and the London Poor. Vol. III.

Mehan, Hugh and Houston Wood
1975 The Reality of Ethnomethodology. New York: Wiley.

Messenger, John C.
1971 "Ibibio Drama," Africa XLI:3(July):207-22.

1973 "The Carver in Anang Society," In The Traditional Artist in African Societies, ed. Warren d'Azevedo. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Mukarovsky, Jan
1978 (1943) "Intentionality and Unintentionality in Art," In Structure, Sign, and Function, pp. 89-128.

1978 Structure, Sign, and Function. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Obraztsov, Sergei
1950 My Profession. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House.

1961 The Chinese Puppet Theatre, translated by J.T. MacDermott. London: Faber and Faber.

On Kon Cho
1979 Korean Puppet Theatre: Kkoktu Kaksi. East Lansing, Mich.: Asian Studies Center, Michigan State University.

Pasqualino, Antonio
1977 L'Opera dei Pupi. Palermo: Sellerio editore.

Salgado, Ramsay Gamini
1977 The Elizabethan Underworld. London: J.M. Dent.

Sapir, Edward
1915 "Abnormal Types of Speech in Nootka," Canada, Geological Survey, Memoir 62, Anthropological Series No. 5. Ottawa: Government Printing Bureau. Reprinted in Selected Writings in Language, Culture, and Personality, ed. David Mandelbaum. Berkeley: U.C. Press, 1949.

Sebeok, Thomas and Donna Jean Umiker-Sebeok, eds.
1976 Speech Surrogates: Drum and Whistle Systems. The Hague: Mouton.

Speaight, George
1955 The History of the English Puppet Theatre. New York: John de Graff.

1970 Punch and Judy, a History. Boston: Plays, Inc.

Spitzer, Leo
1922 Italienische Umgangssprache. Leipzig.

Stern, Theodore
1957 "Drum and whistle 'languages': an analysis of speech surrogates," American Anthropologist 59:487-506. Reprinted in Sebeok and Umiker-Sebeok 1976.

Stoeltje, Beverly
1979 personal communication

Talbot, Percy Amaury
1923 Life in Southern Nigeria. London: MacMillan and Co.

Thompson, Robert Farris
1975 "Icons of the Mind: Yoruba Herbalism Arts in Trans-Atlantic Perspective," African Arts VIII:3(Spring):52-9,89.

Ubeda, Francisco de
1912 (1608) El libro de entretenimiento de la pícara Justina. Madrid. (Reprint of 1608 Brucelles edition.)

Umiker, Donna Jean
1974 "Speech Surrogates: Drum and Whistle Systems," in Current Trends in Linguistics 12: Linguistics and Adjacent Arts and Sciences, ed. by T.A. Sebeok, pp. 497-536.

Uspensky, Boris
1973 A Poetics of Composition. Berkeley: U.C. Press.

Varey, J.E.
1957 Historia de los Títeres en España. Madrid: Revista de Occidente.

Veltruský, Jiří
1978 "Contribution to the Semiotics of Acting," in Sound, Sign, and Meaning, ed. Ladislav Matejka. Ann Arbor: U. Michigan Press. pp. 553-606.

Vološinov, V.N.
1976 (1927) Freudianism: A Marxist Critique, translated by I.R. Titunik. New York: Academic Press.

1973 (1930) Marxism and the Philosophy of Language, translated by Ladislav Matejka and I.R. Titunik. New York: Seminar Press.

Vsevolodskii-Gerngross, Vsevolod
1959 Russkaia ustnaia narodnaia drama. Moscow: Akademiia Nauk.

Warner, Elizabeth
1977 Russian Folk Theatre. The Hague: Mouton.

Zguta, Russell
1978 Russian Minstrels: a History of the Skomorokhi. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Zich, Otakar
1923 "Loutkove divadlo," ("Puppet theatre,") Drobne umeni-Vytvarne snahy 4.

1931 Estetika dramatickeho umeni. Prague.